

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 25, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Description of Related Art in the Background of the Invention in view of Jaffe.

Applicant's claim 1 recites, in relevant portion: "...at least one red, at least one green and at least one blue resonant cavity cathode ray tube optically coupled to said imager and emitting, respectively, said red, said green and said blue light , to produce said image; ..."

It is important to note the distinction between a "resonant microcavity display" "(RMD) and a "cathode ray tube." (CRT) Jaffe discloses only two CRT embodiments of an RMD. One embodiment is described by Jaffe in col. 14, lines 45-53. In this description an embodiment of an RMD "is embodied in a CRT comprising a glass vacuum tube enclosing an electron gun...". Another cited portion of Jaffe (col. 15, lines 27-39) discloses an RMD "can be used in a CRT as a direct view television." Another cited portion of Jaffe (col. 20, lines 29-34) states: "In general, any light source can in principle be substituted by the resonant microcavity display RMD".

However, applicant's invention is not directed to substituting an RMD, as defined by Jaffe, for a light source. Applicant's invention is directed to using the RMD in a CRT, and then the resulting CRT to illuminate a Liquid Crystal Device. Applicant's claim 1 recites "at least one red, at least one green and at least one blue resonant cavity cathode ray tube optically coupled to said imager and emitting, respectively, said red, said green and said blue

10/047,239

PU020018

light , to produce said image; ..."

There is no suggestion in Jaffe to optically couple the resonant cavity cathode ray tube to an imager. A teaching of a resonant microcavity display (RMD) alone is not a teaching to use an RMD in a CRT. More significantly, a teaching to use an RMD in a CRT is not a teaching to optically couple the resulting CRT further to an imager.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 are patentable and nonobvious over the cited references. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application. Such early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 25, 2006

By: 

Christine Johnson
Registration No. 38,507

THOMSON LICENSING INC.
2 Independence Way
Princeton, NJ 08540
609-734-6892